



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Correspondence.

WHAT EVERY CHRISTIAN OUGHT TO KNOW AND DO.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—I sent a few days ago to each of two Roman Catholic friends of mine (laymen) a suggestion relative to the Roman Catholic tract on morals, which has long had so enormous a circulation under the sanction of Archbishop Cullen.

In the last edition of it some of the most objectionable parts are omitted, and I expressed my satisfaction that they had been; but I remonstrated against the *silence* with which this change has been made, which leaves many thousands and tens of thousands, who have been purchasers of the former editions, ignorant that any material change has been made, and, consequently, exposed to the noxious effects of the doctrine which has been set before them by authority. No retraction has been made or warning supplied to guard them against the very lax morality they have been taught. And I suggested that if several candid and intelligent and pure-minded Roman Catholics would come forward to remonstrate they might bring about a remedy for the evil.

I remarked that I am not a person to delight in exposing and exulting over the faults of those of another Church, but that I would rather see them remove for themselves a stain and a scandal to that Church.

As things stand, I remarked, one of the Mussulmen mutineers in India, if he held in his hand the former editions of that tract, might urge, not unreasonably, "If this is Christianity, Christians ought to be hunted down like noxious wild beasts, and every effort made to substitute for their immoral system the purer doctrines of the Koran."

One of the persons I addressed, a gentleman whom I have long known as himself of unblemished integrity, expressed his strong disapprobation of the tract, but lamented the inability he felt to interfere with any prospect of success.

The other sent me a *vindication* of the tract, and has allowed me to offer it to you for publication.

I feel confident you will give it a place in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, on the principle you have always acted on, of hearing both sides. Strictures on that tract have appeared in your columns, and it is but fair that you should put before your readers the defence of it, together with any remarks thereon which you may think fit to subjoin.

I remain, &c.,

D.

The following is the enclosed vindication:—

I had seen before the tract which you enclosed, and had discussed portions of it both with Protestants and with Catholics. In conversation with the latter, I have freely expressed my opinion that certain passages in the first edition were likely to do harm among the class of persons for whom the tract was intended. I did not, however, say (for I did not feel competent to judge) that the casuistry contained in these passages was erroneous, or *per se* objectionable—that was a matter I left to casuists; but I *did* say, and strongly feel, that such passages were, at any rate, likely to be misunderstood; and that considerations which might be most useful for the guidance of confessors, might be most unfit to be brought prominently under the notice of penitents. I have reason to believe that it was on some such view as this that the alterations and omissions in the second edition, which you have referred to, were made—not, be it observed, because they were *erroneous*, but because it was feared they might be misunderstood. If this were so, surely there would be no ground for attributing underhand or disingenuous conduct to those concerned in withdrawing these passages. It was done, you say, "silently" and "secretly;" but if you turn to the title-page of the second edition, you will find that there is little attempt at concealment after all. The words, "A new edition, revised," appear on that title-page. Revision certainly implies either alteration or omission, or both. The title-page, therefore, announces exactly what has been done. But you appear to think that the alterations ought to have been announced and explained in a preface. If they consisted in the correction of "admitted errors," they certainly ought; but if they were made for the reasons I have supposed, there was no such necessity. The author does not prefix any preface or notice of any kind to either edition; he seems to have wished to keep his own personality entirely in the background.

Here I might stop; but the real point at issue still remains behind. Protestants say that there are certain directions and distinctions in this tract, which are plainly immoral and revolting to the natural conscience. Well, then, I will come at once to the passage at page 27, which is, perhaps, the most questionable in the tract, and has been omitted in the second edition. That its omission was right I have no doubt, and I rejoice at it, because the tract was likely to fall into the hands of many persons placed in the precise circumstances of temptation alluded to; who, if disposed to be dishonest, might plausibly shelter themselves under the words of this passage. But that the doctrine laid down might not be useful to confessors, or that it is immoral in itself, is by no means clear. The passage runs, "It is a sin to mix something with what you sell; e.g., water with any liquor, except there is a

common custom of doing it, and it is necessary in order to gain a reasonable profit." Those who object to this passage would maintain, I suppose, that to "mix something with what you sell" is always a sin. If so, it is a sin which is terribly common, and which the English trading community seems to be more deeply infected with (to judge from the disclosures of the Adulteration Committee of the House of Commons) than the same class in any other nation in the world. If, therefore, Protestantism holds a high doctrine in the matter, it seems that it cannot prevent a low practice. Now, let us suppose a Catholic dealer in milk in London to be surrounded by Protestant dealers, and to find (as he certainly might find) that, owing to excessive competition and the consequent low scale of profits, all his fellow-dealers found or fancied themselves compelled to add water to their milk, in order to secure a "reasonable profit." The Catholic dealer feels the difficulty, and consults his confessor on the subject. If his confessor takes the rigid view, he will tell him that he cannot add water to his milk without being guilty of sin. In which case one of two things will happen—either the man, though believing the practice to be sinful, will yet give in to it for the sake of a livelihood (in which case his heart and conscience would become hardened and depraved), or he will give up that line of life altogether, and bring ruin on himself and his family. Is it so very clear that the confessor would be right? On the other hand, suppose him to say this, "If it is, indeed, the common custom of the trade, and if without resorting to it you could not gain a reasonable profit" (i.e., of course, a profit enabling a man not to get rich, but to maintain himself and those dependant on him); "if you tell no lie about it, but should you be taxed with doing so, admit it; and if, finally, you give up the practice the moment you see the possibility of making a fair profit without it, you will commit no sin by conforming to the general custom of the trade." Is it so very clear that in speaking thus the confessor would be wrong? But it will be said all this is *casuistry*. Of course it is; and is all casuistry useless or pernicious? It has not been always thought so in the Church of England; for Jeremy Taylor wrote a long manual of casuistry—the Ductor dubitanti.

The innumerable questions that lie in the debateable border land of morals cannot, I fancy, be satisfactorily settled in the off-hand way which those who do not look into the real condition and circumstances of each case imagine possible.

I have entered at length into this one case, because I wished to show, not that the casuistry applied to it at page 27 is right—for that is a point on which I am not called upon to decide—but that it was perfectly possible that those who withdrew this passage (together with others to which analogous reasoning may be applied) did so from some motive of prudence or expediency; not because they thought them *erroneous*. If so, they have not acted dishonestly in prefixing to the second edition no explanation respecting the omissions. Whence it follows that individual Catholic laymen are not bound to remonstrate against the non-appearance of such explanation, especially if they have good reason to know, as I have, that the actual motive which led to the omissions was such an one as I have supposed.

I wish to say, in conclusion, that even in the second edition there are one or two directions which I should like to see withdrawn; not, as I said before, because I think them indefensible in themselves, or out of place in a manual for confessors, but because they seem to me likely to be misapplied by those for whom the tract is intended.

[We beg to offer our best acknowledgments to the correspondent to whom we are indebted for the above communication, and who has, at the same time, enclosed us underlined copies of both editions of "What every Christian must know and do." We have been thus led to compare carefully the two editions, and thinking the results of the comparison may interest some of our readers, we devote a separate article to the subject. (See *Supra*, p. 49.) We, therefore, think it necessary here only to reply briefly to the defence of that tract now sent us for publication.]

The writer endeavours to defend the doctrine of Roman Catholic moralists by a counter attack upon Protestant practice. He tells us that if Liguori and Father Furniss teach that it is lawful for a trader to adulterate the articles in which he deals, there are at least many Protestants who do the thing, whether their religious guides think it lawful or not; and he gives us to understand that there is no use in our teaching high doctrine, if it does not prevent a low practice.

We must own that it is a lamentable fact that, on the whole, the lives of Christians are much below their theory. But this is unfortunately true of every denomination of Christians, and Roman Catholics are certainly no exceptions to this rule. Though Liguori does not prescribe a very high standard of morality, his standard is very far above that which they generally attain to. It is to the advantage of Roman Catholics that we should judge of their morality, rather by the teaching, even of Liguori, than by the practice of those among them who ought to have been patterns of virtue—than if, for example, we were to judge of their purity by the life of Pope Alexander VI., or of their notions of conjugal fidelity by the practice of princes so zealous for their religion as

Louis XIV. or James II. Well, then, if men's practice is sure to fall below their theory, this is a reason, not for lowering the standard of our moral teaching, but for keeping it high. The rules of morality must not be relaxed because of the shortcomings of individuals. The very way to improve men's practice is to try to get them to aim at some higher standard than any they have yet come up to. We may venture to hope for a man's recovery from sin as long as his conscience tells him that what he has been doing is wrong, since he may thereby be led to struggle against the vices that have hitherto overcome him. But if his religious guides, instead of striving to raise his practice to the level of Christian morality, depress their rules of morality to the level of his practice; if they give him the agreeable information that the things which he has feared were sins are really innocent, and may be indulged in with safety, who can then expect that he should strive against sins which he is told he need not forsake. Nay, as men's practice is almost always worse than their theory, the chances are that he will soon sink still lower than before, and that his code of morals will soon require some additional relaxation.

We wonder it did not strike this apologist for Father Furniss how humiliating it was to his Church to represent the standard of the moral teaching of Roman Catholic divines as regulated by the practice of the worst sort of Protestants. But we have, at all events, shown that no such Protestant errors in practice can justify any relaxation of the rules of morality. The condition is bad of the man who does what his conscience condemns; but still worse of him who has brought his conscience to palliate or approve the sins which he finds it inconvenient to forsake. The man is to be condemned who does not profit by the light which he enjoys; but if the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness.]

THE RULE OF CATHOLIC FAITH—WHAT IS IT?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Having explained some of the points of what I called *negative Romanism*—that is to say, what a man may not believe, and still be orthodox—I will now say a few words on what, according to Veron, only is of faith. I will dare venture to assert that if the peculiar doctrines of the Romish Church, against which we Protestants protest, be brought to the test of Veron's rules, or definitions, they, one and all, will be untenable; and if we are to take his rules as tests of orthodoxy, the most rigid Protestant may be the most orthodox Romanist.

To ascertain what is to be believed as of Catholic faith, Veron lays down the following rules, which I will number for convenience:—

1. "That, and that only, is an article of Catholic faith which has been revealed in the word of God, and proposed by the Catholic Church to all her children, as necessary to be believed with divine faith"—Cap. I, § 1, p. 1.—"Rule of Catholic Faith," Edit. Birmingham, 1833.

This rule, he says, "comprises two parts." The one "revealed in the Word of God," the other "proposed by the Catholic Church."

"A doctrine invested with these two conditions must be believed with divine and Catholic faith. But it no longer belongs to this heavenly deposit if either of these conditions fail—namely, if it be not revealed [in Scripture], or has not been propounded by the Church."—Sec. 2, p. 3.

In the abstract, therefore, no Protestant need shrink from this text; for, unless the doctrine proposed by the Church is revealed in the Scriptures, he need not subscribe it. It is true Veron says that—

"The second condition pre-supposes the first; for as Christ promised His Church the assistance of His Holy Spirit to teach her, and lead her into all truth, it is impossible—unless (as they cannot) these promises fail—that this heavenly guided Church can ever propose anything as revealed which has really not been so."

We quite understand the drift of his subtleties; but still the rule may be subscribed, even with this addition, since it is nowhere revealed in Scripture that the Church of Rome is the Church of Christ; nor is it revealed that the Holy Spirit is promised peculiarly and specially to the Roman Church. But to relieve us from a great difficulty, Veron takes great credit for his Church in making the following admission:—

"We are free to declare that God is the first and supreme Judge, and that Scripture also is a judge of controversies, and a judge, too, of greater authority than the Church, since the Scripture contains the Word of God, whilst the Church only speaks by the mouth of man."—Cap. ii, § xvi. 3, p. 145.

A most safe and wise admission.

That the Church of Rome cannot err, or, in other words, is "infallible," is not a question of expressed or implied revelation. This is a question of fact. Messrs. Kirk and Berrington, in their "Faith of Catholics," distinctly assert that "it is no article of faith that the Church [of Rome] cannot err in MATTERS OF FACT."—(pp. 154-5, edit. 1813.)

The Church of Rome may err, therefore, in alleging as a fact her own infallency. What, then, becomes of "Infallibility?"

Here again Veron comes to the rescue:—

"As the council [of Trent], though speaking of the authority of the Church, and of the universal Church too [making a distinction between the local Roman Church and the universal Church of Christ], on questions of faith and morals abstains from using the word 'Infallibility,' every Catholic is at liberty to

do the same. The term is of itself exceedingly useful and significant, and may be used with advantage in the schools, or in popular instruction, or in sermons: but it is better omitted in all controversy with Protestants. The phrase has not been adopted by any council, nor is it found in the sacred writings; what obligation, then, are we under to employ it, especially as it happens to be considered as objectionable to our adversaries."—*Ibid.*, p. 143.

While these admissions remove very great difficulties, I much doubt whether they will be freely acquiesced in by all classes of priests.

II. The next rule is equally clear and unobjectionable. But what peculiar doctrine of Rome will stand the test of such a rule?

"No doctrine is an article of Catholic faith which is grounded on texts of Scripture which have been interpreted in various senses by the Holy Fathers, or are still differently explained by our best and most learned modern theologians."—*Cap. i.*, § iii. 3, p. 8.

III. The third rule is equally unobjectionable.

"We [Romanists] do not admit as an article of Catholic faith any consequence, however certain, or however logically deduced from premises, one of which is of faith and the other clear by the mere light of reason."—*Ibid.*, § 4, p. 8.

Under this rule he further lays it down that "theological conclusions from Scriptural propositions are not articles of Catholic faith."—(*pp.* 9, 10.) In all this we heartily concur. But what a wreck would be made of the whole system of Romanism if this rule be adopted. Is there one single Romish doctrine that will bear the application of all or any of these tests?

Let us try a few by these rules.

Take the doctrine of Purgatory. As Dr. Wiseman holds the highest Romish ecclesiastical office in this country, I will quote from his Lectures,* as illustration. He says:—

"I have more than once commented on the incorrectness of that method of arguing which demands that we prove every one of our doctrines individually from the Scriptures. I occupied myself during the first course of these lectures in demonstrating the Catholic principle of faith, that the Church of Christ was constituted by Him the depository of His truths, and that although many were recorded in His Holy Word, still many were committed to traditional keeping, and that Christ Himself taught in His Church and secured her from error. It is on this authority that the Catholic grounds his belief in the doctrine of Purgatory; yet not but that its principle is laid down indirectly, at least, in the Word of God."—*Lect. xi.*, vol. ii., p. 53.

Here, then, we have Dr. Wiseman coming in collision with Rules I. and III., it being admitted by him that Purgatory is not revealed in the Word of God, though it may be indirectly, as a "theological conclusion."

Again, not willing to give up scriptural authority for this doctrine, he endeavours to connect it with "praying for the dead." The latter doctrine he asserts is proved from Scripture:—

"To examine fully the proofs of this doctrine (Purgatory), it is necessary to connect it with another Catholic practice of praying for the dead. For this practice is essentially based on the belief in Purgatory. I have no hesitation in saying that the two doctrines go so completely together, that if we succeed in demonstrating the one, the other necessarily follows."—*Ibid.*, pp. 53-4.

Here he falls foul of Rule III., a theological "consequence" or "conclusion," repudiated by Veron.

Then, again, to prove that praying for the dead is sanctioned by what Dr. Wiseman calls "the Word of God," he quotes the well known passage from 2 Macc. xii. 46. Give him the highest ground, the supposed canon adopted by the bishops assembled at the Council of Carthage, and the alleged list of Innocent I.; we have, on the other hand, a long list of fathers who undoubtedly rejected the Maccabees from the sacred canon, so that we may here fairly confront Dr. Wiseman with Rules I. and II. And so again with his next argument founded on Matt. xii. 32, he says:—

"Our blessed Saviour distinguishes two kinds of sins, and calls one a sin against the Holy Ghost. Here is a species of sin, the aggravated nature of which is expressed by its not being forgiven in the next world. Should we not, then, conclude that some other sins may be forgiven there? Why give this peculiar characteristic to one, if no sin is ever pardoned in the next world? Assuredly, we have a right to conclude that there is some remission of sin there; and yet it cannot be either in Heaven or in the place of eternal punishment. We must, therefore, admit some other state in which this must be."—*Ibid.*, p. 57.

This other state he concludes to be the Popish Purgatory.

The only other text cited is from Rev. xxi. 27, and Dr. Wiseman's argument on this text amounts to this—that as impenitent persons cannot go to heaven, and the souls of the penitent cannot go to heaven until they are cleansed, therefore there must be a purgatory to cleanse them.

We at once see that these are only "theological conclusions," which, however probable or plausible they may appear to Dr. Wiseman, are nevertheless condemned by Rule III.

I cite this one branch of the subject as a sample. The tests may be carried out where any peculiar doctrine of Romanism may be presented to us for acceptance as Catholic faith.

The result, therefore, of this investigation is, that according to Veron we Protestants may one and all be

* Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church. London, 1851.

orthodox Romanists, while holding our peculiar Protestant views on the great questions which apparently divide us. Except, however, we must acknowledge the Roman Church to be the "mother and mistress of all Churches," and "promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff."—(*§ 15*, p. 132).

This he insists on, though not supported by either of his rules. Admit this, and, according to Veron, we may practically hold our Protestant prejudices on nearly all other points.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
London, May, 1858. C. H. COLLETTE.

ST. CYPRIAN AND THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

RESPECTED SIR,—While I acknowledge your favour in sending me the last number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and my own culpableness in using hurtful words under any circumstance, I cannot acknowledge that you have even attempted to give a reason for still persisting in saying "that nothing could be more unsafe than to assume as indisputable that St. Cyprian was referring to St. Peter in the passage in question." For, you have not only not hazarded your own opinion, by telling us what St. Cyprian did refer to, but you have even shunned the verdict of the scholiast, whether Protestant or Benedictine.* As to Launoy and his jury of 44, the earliest of them is at least a century too late to give a verdict on the original sense of the word *petram*, as used by St. Cyprian. On this question, we have only three witnesses: viz., St. Cyprian and the two evangelists; or rather their silent writs: our question being—not whether St. Cyprian was or was not referring to Rome; but whether he was referring to St. Peter, and to Matt. xvi. 18.

And if it pleases you to say that nothing is yet established by our controversy, you ought to have added, *except one thing*; and that is, the great principle, denied by you, and acknowledged by us: viz., the necessity of a living judge to decide our disputes—the necessity of the living voice of the evangelist† to tell you with words of fire what he meant, when citing our Lord's words, he wrote—"Thou art Simon, the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter," or a rock; and "on this rock I will build my Church." Do we need the living evangelist to tell us who is meant here by *this rock*? or a living Cyprian to tell us, if that Church, which, in one place, he writes is built on a rock, is the same with that which, in numerous other places, he declares, as plain as dumb letters can, to be built on Peter.‡

Is it not, then, as clear as mathematical demonstration, that St. Cyprian used the words *rock* and *Peter* in the same sense? And does not he who would hold out against this inevitable inference only betray to the world how much he dislikes this whole passage; and verify the adage that a drowning man will catch even at a reed?

But if you are still obstinate, the necessity is yours to tell your readers what St. Cyprian does mean by *petram*? Is it, forsooth, that while the Church on *Peter* is a popish Church; the Church, together with the chair, on the *rock*, is a something else—an Est-nt? For, merely telling us that Rome is not mentioned here, is no answer, and will never do. My translation of this passage from the Oxford edition stands faithfully given in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.‡ Do you give yours, and your commentary thereon, and leave the rest to the reader.

And it is equally clear, notwithstanding your hair-splitting objections, that St. Cyprian from this building of the Church on Peter, understood the Church's dependence on Peter, and from thence his spiritual supremacy. "Peter," says he, "whom the Lord had chosen to be chief." "Peter, in whom He instituted and showed the origin of its (the Church's) unity."—*Ep.* 73. "On one he built His Church; and though He gave equal power to all the apostles, yet that He might manifest unity, He ordained the origin of this unity to be proceeding from one, that the Church might be shown to be one." (6). Pamelius' edition has, "the primacy is given to Peter, &c.," which the Bishop of Oxford confesses to be in four of his manuscripts, but I insist only on the Oxford edition. Lastly, Rome being the proper see of St. Peter, St. Cyprian calls it "the root and matrix of the Catholic Church," the

* In the Oxford edition, the word is *Petrus*; and the Protestant editor, in his note on this passage, says, "Peter is the word, which, according to Rigaltius, is read in the most ancient edition. It is also found in that most celebrated copy, the Veronense. And there is no doubt that Cyprian is here citing the evangelist; for the spirit of Cyprian requires this. Baluze, in the Benedictine, says, 'This true what Pamelius remarks, that Cyprian, in divers places, repeatedly declares the Church to be built on Peter. I question not that the Church is built on Peter; for I know Cyprian believed it.' Which is pretty well for one who sometimes talks like a Huguenot in masquerade."

† John i. 42, Mat. xvi. 18.

‡ Peter, to whose guidance Christ entrusts His sheep, on whom He built His Church.—*Lib. de Discip.* "Peter, upon whom Christ was pleased to build His Church."—*Lib. de bono, &c.* "Peter, on whom Christ had founded His Church."—*Ep.* 55. "Peter, whom Christ had chosen to be chief, and upon whom He built His Church."—*Ep.* 71. "Upon one He builds His Church."—*Lib. de Unit.* "One baptism, and one Holy Ghost, and one Church founded by Christ on Peter."—*Ep.* 70. "The Lord, ordering the honour of a bishop, and the frame of the Church, says to Peter, 'Thou art Peter, and upon that rock I will build my Church.'"*Ep.* 27, *lapida, &c.*

And never otherwise; such as on his faith, on Christ, &c.

* The one in question.

† No. 78, p. 84. Mid. column, top.

‡ *Lib. de unitat. eccles.*

chair of Peter, and the principal Church, which is the (centre or) origin of ecclesiastical unity.* And what is the difference between a principal Church, which is the centre of ecclesiastical unity, and a Church to which, on account of its more potent principality, every Church is necessitated to converge or to be united?† which is the essence of a spiritual supremacy. You, or any objector, will have to show this distinction, and also to inform us why an ancient saint‡ of the apostolic age, when writing to the seven Churches, calls the Roman Church "the Church which presides at Rome," applying the word *presides* to this Church alone.

What St. Cyprian thought of the Bishop of Rome I have already glanced at, in nearly his own words; and finding this to be unimpugned by anything you bring from him, I dwell no more on it. You do, indeed, tell us that he opposed the Bishop of Rome, and, *ergo*, did not acknowledge his supremacy or primacy; which is the same as to tell us that St. Cyprian believed the Pope could not make a new article of faith, or was not infallible, and, *ergo*, was not the supreme bishop. Answer, we believe your *first*, or your *major*; but your *last*, which does not logically flow from it, is begging the question; and begging that which will never be granted, till you can persuade two hundred millions of Catholics, who, you will allow, hold the supremacy or primacy of the present pontiff, that they also hold his infallibility.

I should not have thus dwelt on this passage (in question) had not you fastened on it so particularly. The reason why I put it in the catalogue for St. Peter's primacy, arose from the dislike which I find you and other learned Protestants feel for other passages, on account of your believing them to be false. I confess I was much irritated at the bold idea of putting the authority of so ancient and so great a saint into one scale, and that of Launoy, all backed as he is by 44 of them, into the other; and was roused, unapparently, to vindicate Him from every the least suspicion of having held the rock of the Church to be ought else but Peter—not because Peter's faith might be a hollow basis, for what is securer than that? for whose never-failing the Lord Himself had prayed!—but because the evident sense of Matt. xvi. 18 is that Peter himself was *this rock*; and that this was its original sense in the first three centuries is indisputable, since the earliest expositions extant (viz., of Origen, St. Cyprian, and Tertullian) on this text, refer it to St. Peter, and never to his faith. And there I leave it, with only these two remarks: 1st, If the distinction between St. Peter and his faith was ever regarded by the Church, in the light in which you say you regard it, why was not St. Ambrose, "who first, we believe, suggested"§ it in the fourth century, or St. Cyprian in the third, censured or condemned; seeing that these ancient divines, or rather their dead writings, which is all you know about them, vary on this subject? We know with what jealous care the Church of old watched and detected the least innovation on what she alone knew to be the faith once delivered to the saints. We know how, from the time of Hymeneus and Alexander,* who, for their "suggestions," were first handed over to Satan, through 18 centuries down to the present, she never harboured in her communion any of that breed. How, then, did Origen, and Cyprian, and Launoy's 44, and Launoy's self, and Bellarmine all escape? Can you answer that? 2ndly. It is little matter if "it does so happen that the distinction is not one started by us, or any other Protestant," or by whom it was started; for the starter I suspect to be one of those who come at least 1500 or 1600 years too late to give a lesson to the Church, or to inform her that "our blessed Lord was speaking figuratively as to her foundation."¶

I am, very respected Sir,

Your obedient servant,

W. GERAGHTY.

We are glad to find that Dr. Geraghty has virtually withdrawn the charges of dishonesty and insincerity which he so lightly made against us in his previous letter, though we think he ought to have done so in somewhat more distinct language than by merely admitting his own "culpableness in using hurtful words" in that letter. We can assure him that it was not so much the particular words he used as the *things* he charged us with that we considered insulting and offensive, winding up, as he did, with threatening, that if we did not apologise or explain, his correspondence must cease. As, however, he has condescended to continue his letters, though we neither offered any apology for, nor explained away anything we had previously said, we must only suppose that whatever he may think of the soundness of our arguments, Dr. G. admits the good faith and sincerity with which they are brought forward, though, as we have already said, we think he might have conveyed his apology in language a little more frank and unequivocal. Dr. Geraghty thinks that one thing is established by

* *Ep.* 55, ad Corneli.

† *Innocent*, lib. iii. c. 3. The great Calvinist, Salmasius, in his book, *De Primatu*, pp. 65, says that the verb (*convenire*) here cannot mean *to assemble*; and that whosoever affirms the contrary only shows his ignorance of all antiquity.

‡ St. Ignatius.

§ C. LAYMAN, No. 72, p. 9, middle col.

¶ Luke xlii. 52.

¶ C. LAYMAN, No. 76, p. 45.

* *Ibid.*, * 1 Tim. i. 20.

¶ C. LAYMAN, *Ibid.*, * *Ibid.*